

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

Entry of the above amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (a) in that the above Amendment (1) places the claims in condition for allowance; (2) places the claims in better condition for consideration on appeal, if necessary; (3) does not raise any new issues; and (4) does not add new claims without canceling a corresponding number of claims. For the reasons given above, entry of the above amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 is respectfully requested.

I. Prior Art Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 4,899,276 to Stadler (hereinafter "Stadler"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites that a method of displaying a static information tip comprises the steps of focusing on the first data field; in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; and in response to focusing on the second data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field. Similarly, claim 7 recites that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer perform the steps of focusing on the first data field; in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; focusing on the second data field; and in response to focusing on the second data field, displaying a second static information tip proximate to the second data field.

Stadler does not teach or suggest a method of displaying a static information tip or a computer readable medium having computer-executable instructions as recited by claims 1 and 7, respectively. On the contrary, Stadler discloses a field-directed screen help technique for a data entry system including the steps of positioning the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; pressing a "help" key, such as the F1 key; and in

response to the "help key" being pressed, displaying a "window" which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located. This is not analogous to the method of claim 1 and the computer readable medium of claim 7 because unlike the present invention which recites displaying a static information tip proximate to a data field in response to focusing on the data field, Stadler teaches that a user must first position the cursor in a field which the user desires an explanation to be directed *and* then press the F1 or "help" key to display a window providing the explanation directed to the field in which the cursor is located. Thus, Stadler teaches that two steps must be performed, positioning the cursor and pressing the F1 key, in order to display a window providing an explanation, in contrast to the method and computer readable medium of claims 1 and 7, respectively, which recite one step, focusing on the data field, to display a static information tip.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Stadler. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-6 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Stadler in view of United States Patent No. 4,646,250 to Childress (hereinafter "Childress"), and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,736,984 to Jellinek et al. (hereinafter "Jellinek"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1 and 7 are allowable over Stadler. Since claims 2-5 and 8-11 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Stadler does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 2-5, and 8-11 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites that a method of displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprises the steps of focusing on a first data field; in response to focusing on the first data field, displaying a first static information tip proximate to the first data field; determining the data entered into the first data field is erroneous; placing an error marker adjacent to the first data field; refocusing on the first data field; and displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the first data field. Likewise,

claim 12 recites that a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprises a computer program module operative to focus on a first data field; to display a first static information tip proximate to the first data field in response to focusing on the first data field; to determine the data entered into the first data field is erroneous; to place an error marker adjacent to the first data field; to refocus on the first data field; and to display a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, the second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the first data field.

Stadler fails to teach or suggest a method of displaying a static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 6 and a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprising a computer program module as recited by claim 12. On the contrary, as discussed above, Stadler discloses a field-directed help screen technique including the steps of positioning the cursor in a field in which an explanation is desired; pressing a "help" key, such as the F1 key; and in response to the "help key" being pressed, displaying a "window" which provides an explanation that is specifically directed to the field in which the cursor is located. This is not analogous to the method of claim 6 and the system of claim 12 because Stadler teaches that two steps must be performed, positioning the cursor and pressing the F1 key, in order to display a window providing an explanation, in contrast to the method of claim 6 and the system of claim 12 which recite one step, focusing on the data field, to display a static information tip.

Moreover, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed, without suggesting that the data entered into the data fields is determined erroneous; an error marker is placed adjacent to the data fields, the data fields are refocused on; and a second static information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data fields is displayed. In fact, Stadler fails to teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field.

The Office Action recognizes that Stadler fails to disclose means for detecting or handling errors within a field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Childress to allegedly cure the deficiencies of the teaching of Stadler. However, like to Stadler, Childress fails to teach or suggest a method of displaying a

static information tip and an error marker as recited by claim 6 and a system for displaying a static information tip and an error marker comprising a computer program module as recited by claim 12. Instead, Childress discloses an interactive data entry system that checks the correctness of the data entered by a user into a data entry field, and if an error is detected, then redisplayes the incorrectly entered data with highlighting, without suggesting providing a first information tip in response to focusing on the data entry field and providing a second information tip containing information for correcting the data entered into the data entry field. Therefore, like Stadler, Childress fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claims 6 and 12.

The Office Action recognizes that Stadler and Childress do not provide means for displaying a second static information tip proximate to the first data field, as recited by the present invention, and relies on the teaching of Jellinek to allegedly cure these deficiencies. However, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek does not teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claims 6 and 12. Instead, Jellinek teaches a method and apparatus for processing user defined input including receiving input data from a user in a first graphical processing element, determining whether the input data is valid, and if the input is determined invalid, displaying a feedback message in combination with the first graphical processing element in a second graphical processing element. This is not analogous to the method and system recited in claims 6 and 12, respectively, because Jellinek does not disclose providing a first static information tip in response to focusing on the graphical processing element. Therefore, like Stadler and Childress, Jellinek fails to teach or suggest the present invention as embodied in claims 6 and 12.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Stadler, Childress, and Jellinek and subsequently modify the teaching of Stadler as suggested in the Office Action absent the impermissible use of hindsight because, as discussed above, Stadler does not teach or suggest any means for detecting or handling errors within a data field. Instead, Stadler teaches that when all the data fields have been filled, the next data entry screen may be automatically displayed or the user might be required to press a SAVE key before the data entered into the several fields is saved and the next data entry screen is displayed. However, there is no suggestion in the teaching of Stadler that prior to displaying the next data entry screen or after the next data entry screen is displayed, the

data fields are checked to determine if the data entered into the fields is erroneous, and if so, providing information to correct the erroneous data. Thus, the only motivation for such a combination of teachings and subsequent modification of the teaching of Stadler has been deemed from a review of Applicants' invention, not from what is being taught or suggested from the cited art. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of the teaching of Stadler with the teachings of Childress and Jellinek is improper.

For at least these reasons, claims 6 and 12 are allowable over Stadler. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-12 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-12 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5042.



Merchant & Gould
3200 IDS Center
80 South 80th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2215
Telephone: 404.954.5100

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jodi L. Hartman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251